

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

Claims 1-19 were previously pending and under consideration.

Claim 20 is added herein.

Therefore, claims 1-20 are now pending and under consideration.

Claims 1-19 are rejected.

Claims 1, 5, 8-17 and 19 are amended herein.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the recent Interview. At the Interview it was discussed that features such as "overlap, proximity, or direct selection of the element in relation to a connector ... may distinguish the claim over the prior art".

Applicant also discussed that any of these types of selection can be further distinguished by a selection criteria checking process (or the like) that checks a selection criteria (e.g. proximity, overlap, contact, etc.) while interactive movement (dragging, etc.) is occurring. For background understanding, please see Figures 34A-36D. The prior art does not check a selection criteria against a movement or drag while an element is being interactively moved or dragged or while a movement or drag is occurring. Furthermore, the prior art does not discuss that while a user interactively controls movement the selection criteria or the like (e.g. overlap, contact, etc.) is checked against and when satisfied the connector is designated or selected (or simply treated as an insertion target) with a response of inserting at the connector.

It is respectfully noted that, when inserting, any associated creating of a connector need not imply actual instantiation of a logical representation of the connector, but rather reflects that a new connection between two nodes (elements etc.) is displayed. A pre-existing connector object that newly connects two nodes may be considered to be a new connector in the sense that it becomes a connector that did not previously show a connection between the two nodes.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §§ 102 AND 103

In the Office Action, at pages 3-4, claims 5, 7, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Camacho. At page 5, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Camacho. Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11, and 13-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Camacho and further in view of Tenev. These rejections are traversed and reconsideration is requested.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the Interview, the comments above, and the amendments to the claims herein, the claims are distinguishable over the prior art. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.


Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____

28 May 2004

By: _____



James T. Strom
Registration No. 48,702

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501